1	COX & MOYER					
2						
3	703 Market Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94103 Tel: (415) 543-9464 Fax: (415) 777-1828					
5	Attorneys for Plaintiffs					
7						
8	IN THE UNLIMITED JURISDICTION [SUPERIOR] COURT OF THE					
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO					
10						
11	BLESSED HERVE,	No: CPF 03-502 895				
12	Plaintiff, )	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND				
13	vs.	FOR JURY TRIAL				
14 15	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ALICE DICROCE, GLENN ALCARAZ, MARC H.) CHAN AND DOES 1-100,					
16	Defendants.					
17						
18	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND	FOR JURY TRIAL				

## COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, Blessed Herve ( Plaintiff ), hereby alleges as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff is a resident of the City and County of San Francisco. The Plaintiff is a citizen of the Republic of Congo, and resides in the United States under a grant of political asylum.
- 2. Defendants, City and County of San Francisco, is a public entity within the meaning of Government Code § 811.2 and a local public entity within the meaning of Government Code § 900.4.
- 3. Defendants, Alice DiCroce, Glenn Alcaraz, and Marc H. Chan (the Officers ) are and at all relevant times mentioned herein, employed as police officers by the City and County of San Francisco and were acting within the scope of their employment as police officers for the

COX & MOYER 703 Market St., Ste 1800 San Francisco, CA 94103

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

City and County of San Francisco. At all relevant times mentioned herein, each Officer was an agent, principal, servant, franchisee, joint venturer, partner, employee and/or co-conspirator of the other Officers; that at all of said times each of said Officers was acting within the course and scope of said agency, service, franchise, joint venture, partnership, employment and/or conspiracy.

- 4. Defendants, Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued herein by fictitious names pursuant to C.C.P. §474. Plaintiff does not at this time know the true names, capacities nor specific activities of said defendants, but alleges on information and belief that each of said defendants is or may be legally responsible for the injuries and damages to plaintiff alleged below and plaintiff therefore prays that the names of said defendants and their activities may be inserted herein when said name, capacity and/or activity is ascertained. At all relevant times herein mentioned, each Doe defendant was an agent, principal, servant, franchisee, joint venturer, partner, employee and co-conspirator of the other defendants herein mentioned; that at all of said times each of said defendants was acting within the course and scope of said agency, service, franchise, joint venture, partnership, employment and conspiracy.
- 5. With respect to Plaintiff's claims against the City and County of San Francisco, Plaintiff has satisfied all conditions precedent to bringing said claims by filing the tort claim (attached hereto as Exhibit A) with said Defendant. Said Defendant rejected said tort claim, and a copy of said rejection is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 6. On about March 27, 2003, said Defendant Officers and Does 1 through 10 verbally assaulted and physically battered the Plaintiff (a) at a location near the intersection of Geary and Taylor Streets in San Francisco, (b) in a police patrol car operated by certain of the Defendant Officers, and (c) at the San Francisco police Central Station. Among other things, at Central Station, Defendant Officer DiCroce punched the Plaintiff in the stomach while the Plaintiff s hands were handcuffed behind his back, physically forced the Plaintiff to sit on a bench covered in human feces, choked the Plaintiff on the neck, slammed the Plaintiff s head into the wall of a holding cell at Central Station, kicked the Plaintiff in his testicles and grabbed his testicles. Defendant Officer DiCroce also made numerous threatening remarks to the Plaintiff

- 7. Said Defendants, together with Defendant Officer DiCroce, and upon information and belief, Does 11-100, all conspired together in an attempt to cover up the abuse leveled upon the Plaintiff. Evidence of said conspiracy include, without limitation, that said Defendant Officers, including said Doe defendants, prepared, authorized and or ratified the filing of a false police report that, among other things, does not mention that this abuse occurred. Furthermore, upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that said Defendants failed to file necessary reports in order to cover up the fact that the abuse had occurred. The Defendants activities as described in this paragraph were done intentionally and with a willful desire to violate Plaintiffs civil rights, and to cause the Plaintiff to suffer injury, pain, fear, anxiety, humiliation, physical and emotional distress. The actions of the Defendants described herein were willful and malicious and were intended to oppress and cause injury to plaintiff; furthermore, said Defendants acted knowingly, willfully, and maliciously, and with reckless and callous disregard for Plaintiff's safety, health and his civil rights. The aforesaid Defendants either performed, authorized or ratified said malicious, willful and callous conduct. Therefore, Plaintiff prays for an assessment of punitive damages against said Defendants.
- 8. The Plaintiff further alleges on information and belief that Does 11through 100 are members of the San Francisco Police Department and have conspired with the Defendant

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1	Officers in an attempt to cover up the fact that Plaintiff suffered these abuses at the hands of the			
2	2 Defendant Officers. Acts in furtherance of s	aid conspiracy/cover-up include without limitation		
3	3 failing to file a police reports concerning the	abuse after the Plaintiff reported being abused.		
4 5	VIOLATION OF PL	AINST DEFENDANT OFFICERS ONLY AINTIFFS CIVIL RIGHTS .S.C. § 1983)		
6	6 9. Plaintiff hereby incorporates	each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set		
7	7 forth in this Cause of Action.	forth in this Cause of Action.		
8	8 10. The Actions of the Defendant	Officers and Does 1 through 100 described herein		
9	9 constitute a deprivation of the Plaintiff's Con	nstitutional right to Due Process and Equal		
10	Protection guaranteed by the Fourteenth Am	endment to the Constitution. Said acts also		
11	constitute a violation of the rights secured to the Plaintiff under statutes and/or other laws of the			
12	United States, including without limitation 18 U.S.C. § 242, which states in pertinent part:			
13	custom, willfully subjects any	law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or person in any State, Territory,		
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	rights, privileges, or immunit Constitution or laws of the Un			
16	punishments, pains, or penalt an alien, or by reason of his c the punishment of citizens, sh	es, on account of such person being olor, or race, than are prescribed for all be fined under this title or		
17	imprisoned not more than one	year, or both; and if bodily injury ed in violation of this sectionshall		
18		prisoned not more than ten years, or		
19	aggravated sexual abuse,	shall be fined under this title, or ars or for life, or both (Emphasis		
20	added)	, ( 1		
21	21 11. The actions of the Defendant	Officers were performed under color of state law;		
22	namely under color of their position as office	ers in the San Francisco Police Department and		
23	violated Plaintiff's Constitutional rights and	rights secured by statute as set forth above.		
24	12. As a direct and proximate res	alt of the violation of Plaintiff's Constitutional and		
25	statute guaranteed rights, Plaintiff has suffer	ed general and special damages in an amount to be		
26	proven at trial. Said damages include, but are not limited to: Plaintiff suffered personal injuries			
27	including without limitation bruises, pain, humiliation, fear, anxiety, and extreme mental and			

emotional distress; Plaintiff has incurred medical bills to treat his personal injuries; Plaintiff has

28

1	also incurred other costs and expenses including without limitation the cost of cleaning his		
2	clothing to remove human feces (which the Officers forced Plaintiff to sit in). The Defendants		
3	conspired to deprive Plaintiff of his civil rights, by doing acts which include without limitation,		
4	physically abusing Plaintiff; and attempting to cover up the fact that their abuse of the Plaintiff		
5	had occurred. Such conduct caused and continues to cause Plaintiff to suffer fear, humiliation		
6	and severe emotional distress and physical manifestations of said distress, including headaches.		
7 8	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT OFFICERS ONLY CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE PLAINTIFF S CIVIL RIGHTS (42 U.S.C. § 1985)		
9	13. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set		
10	forth in this Cause of Action.		
11	14. 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) provides a cause of action for any person who is injured		
12	when two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or		
13	defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny		
14	any citizen the equal protection of the laws.		
15	15. Further, 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3) provides a cause of action for any person who is		
16	injured when two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire for the purpose of		
17	depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of		
18	the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws.		
19	16. The actions of the Defendants constitute an unlawful conspiracy to deprive the		
20	Plaintiff of his civil rights, in violation of the above-quoted provisions from 42 U.S.C. §§		
21	1985(2) and (3).		
22	17. The actions of the Defendants were the direct and proximate cause of the		
23	Plaintiff s injuries and damages as described above.		
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM VIOLENCE (Civil Code § 52(b); Civil Code § 51.7(a))		
26	18. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set		
27	forth in this Cause of Action.		
28	19. This Third Cause of Action is brought pursuant to California Civil Code section		

52(b), which states, in pertinent part:

Who ever denies the right provided by <u>Section 51.7</u> or 51.9, or aids, incites, or conspires in that denial, is liable for each and every offense for the actual damages suffered by any person denied that right and, in addition, the following: (1) An amount to be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, for exemplary damages. (2) A civil penalty of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) to be awarded to the person denied the right provided by Section 51.7 in any action brought by the person denied the right, or by the Attorney General, a district attorney, or a city attorney. (3) Attorney's fees as may be determined by the court.

20. The actions of the Defendants, as described herein, violated Civil Code section

51.7(a), which states, in pertinent part:

All persons within the jurisdiction of this state have the right to be free from any violence, or intimidation by threat of violence, committed against their persons or property because of their race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, political affiliation, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, or position in a labor dispute, or because another person perceives them to have one or more of those characteristics. The identification in this subdivision of particular bases of discrimination is illustrative rather than restrictive. (Emphasis added)

21. The Defendants actions were the direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's injuries and damages as described herein.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT OFFICERS ONLY INTERFERENCE WITH PLAINTIFF S CIVIL RIGHTS (Civil Code § 52.1)

22. This Fourth Cause of Action is brought pursuant to Civil Code section 52.1, which states, in pertinent part:

(a) If a person or persons, whether or not acting under color of law, interferes by threats, intimidation, or coercion, or attempts to interfere by threats, intimidation, or coercion, with the exercise or enjoyment by any individual or individuals of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or of the rights secured by the Constitution or laws of this state. . .

(b) Any individual whose exercise or enjoyment of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or of rights secured by the Constitution or laws of this state, has been interfered with, or attempted to be interfered with, as described in subdivision (a), may institute and prosecute in his or her own name and on his or her own behalf a civil action for damages, including, but not limited to, damages under Section 52, injunctive relief, and other appropriate equitable relief to protect the peaceable exercise or enjoyment of the right or rights secured.

(c) An action brought pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) may be

COX & MOYER 703 Market St., Ste 1800 San Francisco, CA 94103 filed either in the superior court for the county in which the conduct complained of occurred or in the superior court for the county in which a person whose conduct complained of resides or has his or her place of business. . . \* \* \* \*

- (h) In addition to any damages, injunction, or other equitable relief awarded in an action brought pursuant to subdivision (b), the court may award the petitioner or plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees
- 23. The actions of the Defendans described herein constitute a violation of section 52.1(a) in that said Defendants employed threats, intimidation, and/or coercion to interfere with the Plaintiff's rights guaranteed by the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as well as rights guaranteed by the statutes and/or other laws of the United States, including without limitation 18 U.S.C. § 242. The Defendants also employed threats, intimidation and/or coercion to interfere with the Plaintiff's rights guaranteed by the California Constitution and the laws of the California, including without limitation rights guaranteed by Civil Code section 51.7 (described above).
- 24. The Defendant Officers actions in violation of these statutes and Constitutional provisions were the direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's injuries and damages as described herein.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BATTERY

- 25. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set forth in this Cause of Action.
- 26. In doing the acts alleged herein, the Defendant Officers acted with the intent to make a harmful contact with plaintiff's person.
- 27. At no time did Plaintiff consent to any of the acts of Defendant Officer alleged herein.
  - 28. The Defendants are therefore guilty of committing a battery against the Plaintiff.
- 29. The actions of the Defendants were the direct and proximate cause of the injuries and damages suffered by the Plaintiff as alleged herein.

30. At all times herein mentioned, the Defendants were the employees of defendant City and County of San Francisco and, in doing the acts herein described and referred to, were acting in the course and within the scope of their authority as employees, and in the transaction of the business of the employment. Defendant City and County of San Francisco is, therefore, liable to plaintiff for the acts of the Defendant Officers as heretofore alleged. (See, Government Code § 815.2.)

## SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST CITY AND COUNT OF SAN FRANCISCO NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING AND/OR RETENTION OF UNFIT EMPLOYEES

- 31. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set forth in this Cause of Action.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in doing the acts as heretofore alleged, Defendant City and County of San Francisco knew, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that one or more of the Defendant Officers were incompetent and unfit to perform the duties for which they were employed, and that said Defendant Officers harbored prejudices against persons such as the Plaintiff and were inclined toward violence against such persons, and that an undue risk to persons such as Plaintiff would exist because of the employment of the Defendant Officers.
- 33. Despite this advance knowledge, Defendant City and County of San Francisco retained the Defendant Officers as employees in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, and failed to properly train and/or supervise said Defendant Officers in order to insure the protection of persons such as the Plaintiff.
- 34. The actions of the City and County of San Francisco in negligently hiring, training and/or retaining the Defendant Officers was the direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's

1	injuries and damages as described herein.		
2	SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS		
4	35. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set		
5	forth in this Cause of Action.		
6 7	36. The actions of the Defendants described herein were extreme and outrageous and		
8	were intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer		
9			
10	37. As the proximate result of the acts of the Defendants, Plaintiff suffered		
11	humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and has been injured in mind		
12			
13			
14	REQUEST FOR RELIEF		
15	Plaintiff therefore respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief:		
16	1. Award Plaintiff special and general damages according to proof.		
17	2. With respect to Plaintiff's Second and Third Causes of Action, award the Plaintiff a		
18	civil penalty of \$25,000 against each of the Defendant Officers, in accordance with Civil Code		
19			
20			
21	3. Award the Plaintiff costs and attorneys fees in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b),		
22	Civil Code §§ 52.1(h) and 52(b)(3) and any other applicable statute.		
23	4. Award exemplary and punitive damage against the Defendant Officers.		
24	5. Award the Plaintiff any other relief that the Court determines to be just and equitable		
25			
26	/////		
27			
28			
ER			

	Case3:03-cv-04699-MMC Document1 Filed10/20/03 Page10 of 11		
1			
2	<u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>		
3	Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial.		
4		Respectfully submitted,	
5	Dated:, 2003	COX & MOYER	
6	Daicu, 2003	COA & WOTER	
7			
8		By: STEPHEN T. COX	
9		Attorneys for Plaintiff, Blessed Herve	
10			
11 12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
COX & MOYER 703 Market St., Ste 1800 San Francisco, CA 94103	COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR	R JURY TRIAL - 10 -	

	Cases.03-cv-04699-MMC Document Filed10/20/03 Page11 0i 11		
1	VERIFICATION		
2	I, Blessed Herve, hereby verify that I have read the foregoing <b>COMPLAINT AND</b>		
3			
4	<b>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</b> I certify that the facts stated therein are true.		
5	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the		
6	foregoing is true and correct.		
7			
8	Dated:		
9	Blessed Herve		
10	Herve028.COMPLAINT.wpd		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28 YER			

COX & MOYER 703 Market St., Ste 1800 San Francisco, CA 94103